

Categorical Exclusion Checklist for Proposed TVA Actions

Categorical Exclusion Number Claimed 26	Organization ID Number RLR282636	Tracking Number <i>(NEPA Administration Use Only)</i> 36829
Form Preparer Tyler Ferguson	Project Initiator/Manager Tyler Ferguson	Business Unit P&NR - Reservoir Land Use & Permitting
Project Title 26a Category 2 RLR 282636 Doug Larger Norris Reservoir		Hydrologic Unit Code
Description of Proposed Action <i>(Include Anticipated Dates of Implementation)</i> For Proposed Action See Attachments and References		<input type="checkbox"/> Continued on Page 3 <i>(if more than one line)</i>
Initiating TVA Facility or Office Eastern Region		TVA Business Units Involved in Project For Business Unit Listing See Attachments and References
Location <i>(City, County, State)</i> For Project Location see Attachments and References		

Parts 1 through 4 verify that there are no extraordinary circumstances associated with this action:

Part 1. Project Characteristics

Is there evidence that the proposed action...	No	Yes	Commitment	Information Source for Insignificance
1.Is major in scope?	X			NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
2.Is part of a larger project proposal involving other TVA actions or other federal agencies?	X			NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
* 3.Involves non-routine mitigation to avoid adverse impacts ?	X		No	Ferguson, Tyler 08/25/2017
4.Is opposed by another federal, state, or local government agency?	X			For comments see attachments
* 5.Has environmental effects which are controversial?	X			For comments see attachments
* 6.Is one of many actions that will affect the same resources?		X		For comments see attachments
7.Involves more than minor amount of land?	X			NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017

*If "yes" is marked for any of the above boxes, consult with NEPA Administration on the suitability of this project for a categorical exclusion.

Part 2. Natural and Cultural Features Affected

Would the proposed action...	No	Yes	Permit	Commitment	Information Source for Insignificance
1.Potentially affect endangered, threatened, or special status species?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
2.Potentially affect historic structures, historic sites, Native American religious or cultural properties, or archaeological sites?		X	No	No	For comments see attachments
3.Potentially take prime or unique farmland out of production?	X		No	No	NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
4.Potentially affect Wild and Scenic Rivers or their tributaries?	X		No	No	Fouse, Jerry G. 08/01/2017
5.Potentially affect a stream on the Nationwide Rivers Inventory?	X		No	No	Fouse, Jerry G. 08/01/2017
6.Potentially affect wetlands?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
7.Potentially affect water flow, stream banks or stream channels?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
8.Potentially affect the 100-year floodplain?		X	No	No	For comments see attachments
9.Potentially affect ecologically critical areas, federal, state, or local park lands, national or state forests, wilderness areas, scenic areas, wildlife management areas, recreational areas, greenways, or trails?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
10.Contribute to the spread of exotic or invasive species?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
11.Potentially affect migratory bird populations?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
12.Involve water withdrawal of a magnitude that may affect aquatic life or involve interbasin transfer of water?	X		No	No	NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
13.Potentially affect surface water?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
14.Potentially affect drinking water supply?	X		No	No	NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
15.Potentially affect groundwater?	X		No	No	NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
16.Potentially affect unique or important terrestrial habitat?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
17.Potentially affect unique or important aquatic habitat?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments

Part 3. Potential Pollutant Generation

Would the proposed action potentially (including accidental or unplanned)...	No	Yes	Permit	Commitment	Information Source for Insignificance
1.Release air pollutants?	X		No	No	CBC, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
2.Generate water pollutants?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
3.Generate wastewater streams?	X		No	No	CBC, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
4.Cause soil erosion?		X	No	No	For comments see attachments
5.Discharge dredged or fill materials?		X	Yes	No	For comments see attachments
6.Generate large amounts of solid waste or waste not ordinarily generated?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
7.Generate or release hazardous waste (RCRA)?	X		No	No	CBC, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
8.Generate or release universal or special waste, or used oil?	X		No	No	CBC, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
9.Generate or release toxic substances (CERCLA, TSCA)?	X		No	No	CBC, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
10.Involve materials such as PCBs, solvents, asbestos, sandblasting material, mercury, lead, or paints?	X		No	No	CBC, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
11.Involve disturbance of pre-existing contamination?	X		No	No	Ferguson, Tyler 07/19/2017
12.Generate noise levels with off-site impacts?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
13.Generate odor with off-site impacts?	X		No	No	CBC, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
14.Produce light which causes disturbance?	X		No	No	CBC, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
15.Release of radioactive materials?	X		No	No	CBC, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
16.Involve underground or above-ground storage tanks or bulk storage?	X		No	No	CBC, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
17.Involve materials that require special handling?	X		No	No	CBC, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017

Part 4. Social and Economic Effects

Would the proposed action...	No	Yes	Permit	Commitment	Information Source for Insignificance
1.Potentially cause public health effects?	X			No	NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
2.Increase the potential for accidents affecting the public?	X			No	For comments see attachments
3.Cause the displacement or relocation of businesses, residences, cemeteries, or farms?	X			No	NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
4.Contrast with existing land use, or potentially affect resources described as unique or significant in a federal, state, or local plan?	X			No	For comments see attachments
5.Disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations?	X			No	NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
6.Involve genetically engineered organisms or materials?	X			No	NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
7.Produce visual contrast or visual discord?	X			No	Ferguson, Tyler 07/19/2017
8.Potentially interfere with recreational or educational uses?	X			No	For comments see attachments
9.Potentially interfere with river or other navigation?		X	Yes	No	For comments see attachments
10.Potentially generate highway or railroad traffic problems?	X			No	For comments see attachments

Part 5. Other Environmental Compliance/Reporting Issues

Would the proposed action...	No	Yes	Commitment	Information Source for Insignificance
1.Release or otherwise use substances on the Toxic Release Inventory list?	X		No	NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
2.Involve a structure taller than 200 feet above ground level?	X		No	NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
3.Involve site-specific chemical traffic control?	X		No	NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
4.Require a site-specific emergency notification process?	X		No	NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
5.Cause a modification to an existing environmental permit or to existing equipment with an environmental permit or involve the installation of new equipment/systems that will require a permit?	X		No	NOA, Ferguson, Tyler 05/15/2017
6.Potentially impact operation of the river system or require special water elevations or flow conditions??	X		No	Ferguson, Tyler 07/19/2017
7.Involve construction or lease of a new building or demolition or renovation of existing building (i.e. major changes to lighting, HVAC, and/or structural elements of building of 1000 sq. ft. or more)?	X		No	Ferguson, Tyler 07/19/2017

Parts 1 through 4: If "yes" is checked, describe in the discussion section following this form why the effect is insignificant. Attach any conditions or commitments which will ensure insignificant impacts. Use of non-routine commitments to avoid significance is an indication that consultation with NEPA Administration is needed.

An ☐ EA or ☐ EIS Will be prepared.

Based upon my review of environmental impacts, the discussion attached, and/or consultations with NEPA Administration, I have determined that the above action does not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment and that no extraordinary circumstances exist. Therefore, this proposal qualifies for a categorical exclusion under Section 5.2. 26 of TVA NEPA Procedures.

Project Initiator/Manager Tyler Ferguson	Date 09/01/2017
TVA Organization UNKN	E-mail tferguso@tva.gov
	Telephone

Environmental Concurrence Reviewer

W. Doug White 09/01/2017

Signature

Preparer Closure

Tyler Ferguson 09/01/17

Signature

Other Environmental Concurrence Signatures (as required by your organization)

Signature

Signature

Signature

Signature

Other Review Signatures (as required by your organization)

Attachments/References

Description of Proposed Action Continued from Page 1

Section 26a application for the construction of three floating facilities with spud poles on Norris Reservoir. The three facilities will replace a previously approved floating multislip facility which was not constructed. There is an existing gravel ramp which is proposed to be capped with concrete that will be incorporated within this review as well. The permit will also incorporate previously approved, upland structures. Applicant(s): Doug Larger 351 Industrial Drive Minster OH 45865

Project Location Continued from Page 1

CAMPBELL, TN, County, State: CAMPBELL, TN Map Sheet(s): 145 NW Quad Sheet 35 C/D Stage Stream(s): Davis Cr 1.60 R Powell R 16.38 R

TVA Business Units Involved in Project Continued from Page 1

EE&SS - Environmental Permitting & Compliance,P&NR - Reservoir Land Use & Permitting,P&NR - Reservoir Property & Resource Mgmt

CEC General Comment Listing

1. In the Information Source columns associated with the checklist questions, NOA refers to Nature of Action and CBC refers to Cleared By Criteria. These criteria are described in the Resource Stewardship Prescreening Criteria Checklist Instructions.
By: Tyler Ferguson 05/15/2017
2. Tennessee Wildlife Resource Agency (TWRA) provided copies of the Recreational Boating Accident and Incidence Reports between Powell River Mile 13-19 for the three year period from 2014-2016, inclusive. This area included the Davis Creek and Powell River areas of the proposed dock project by Norris Point Campground.

A review of this data showed one boating incident, a stationary vessel explosion and fire located at Davis Creek Mile 3.4 +/- as result of leaking fuel and poorly vented fumes resulting in injuries and damage but no fatality. No moving boat accidents were reported in this reach of Davis Creek and the Powell River for the three year period as reviewed.

Conclusion is that boating accidents/collisions seem to be nonexistent in this reach of Davis Creek and the Powell River. With boaters continuing to comply with TWRA "boat operator safety rules" recreational boating should continue to be a safe pursuit in this section of Norris Reservoir (Davis Creek and the Powell River). TVA has no recreational boating assessment evidence on which to deny the 26a permit application and should move forward with approval.

By: Jerry G Fouse 08/01/2017

3. NO COMMENT TEXT
4. By: 26a Added Comment
Auto Inserted By External System
5. By: 26a Added Comment
NO COMMENT TEXT
6. By: 26a Added Comment
NO COMMENT TEXT
7. By: 26a Added Comment
NO COMMENT TEXT
8. By: 26a Added Comment
NO COMMENT TEXT
9. By: 26a Added Comment
NO COMMENT TEXT
10. By: 26a Added Comment
NO COMMENT TEXT
11. By: 26a Added Comment
NO COMMENT TEXT
12. By: 26a Added Comment
NO COMMENT TEXT
13. By: 26a Added Comment
Previous permit package
14. By: 26a Added Comment
NO COMMENT TEXT

15. NO COMMENT TEXT
By: 26a Added Comment
16. Updated site plan for proposed facilities.
By: 26a Added Comment
17. Responses received from the Public Notice
By: 26a Added Comment
18. Email from navigation regarding the application request.
By: 26a Added Comment
19. SHPO coordination letter
By: 26a Added Comment
20. Public Notice
By: 26a Added Comment
21. Public notice approval tracking sheet
By: 26a Added Comment
22. Director Edmondson approval
By: 26a Added Comment
23. NO COMMENT TEXT
By: 26a Added Comment
24. NO COMMENT TEXT
By: 26a Added Comment

CEC Comment Listing

Part 1 Comments

4. TVA has recieved no opposition from another federal, state, or local government agency during the review of this project.
By: Tyler Ferguson 08/25/2017
5. TVA offered a public comment period for the proposed action between June 9th and July 9th, 2017. A total of 22 comments were received, all in opposition to the project. The majority of the comments focused on the operation of the backlying campground and not the construction of the dock. TVA has no authority over how the backlying property may be used.

Commenters raised opposition to the applicant's campground and raised concern over the potential public safety, noise, trash/waste, septic, and access issues to the campground. Additionally, concerns related to boater safety, shoreline erosion, and water quality associated with the proposed dock were raised. However, after completing the review of the environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, TVA has determined that no significant environmental effects are anticipated from the construction of the proposed dock facility.
By: W. D White 09/01/2017
6. Addresses in Shoreline Management Initiative Environmental Impact Statement
By: Tyler Ferguson 05/15/2017

Part 2 Comments

1. (part 2) Plants and Champion Trees: Within a 5 mile search radius EORs occurred for 11 state listed plant species. The various species commonly found on Norris have State rankings ranging from Special Concern (SPCO), Commercially Exploited (S-CE), Threatened (T or THE) and Endangered (E or END). Most of the recorded species within the search radii of this project are located on the nearby state forest or state parks and will not be affected by this project. There area is flowage with no required VMP and is maintained a mown lawn. There is no tree cutting requested.

Terrestrial Animals, Wading Bird Colonies (Heronries) and Caves: Within a 3 mile search radius of the project site EORs occurred for 2 terrestrial species and 2 caves. One of the species listed is the Sharp-shinned Hawk and the other is for a record for Indiana Bat. The Indian Bat records go back to 1981, with the most recent survey being 0-20 bats in 2002. Since no new vegetation management is requested and the caves in the area will not be affected (See attached reports on the cave(s) and bat use in attachments to Section 2; Questions 1 and 16 if needed) there will be no impacts.

I concur with approval.
By: Tim D Pruitt 09/01/2017

1. A review of the ALIS Heritage data base was conducted. Please see attached Spread Sheet for detailed list of species. (part 1)

Aquatic Animals: Within the required 10 mile search radius EORs for 5 aquatic species were recorded. All of these records are listed as extirpated or historical within the reservoir area. Historical listing generally means the species likely existed in the area streams and rivers prior to impoundment. Typically when species do occur within this 10-mile radius search and are listed as extant the records are found in the more riverine sections of the reservoir, the reservoir tail waters, or smaller tributary streams nearby. These areas reflect locations where appropriate habitat still exists for these species to survive and reproduce. In this instance three of the fish (2 darters one dace) species listed are small stream species found along the highland rim of the Cumberland Plateau and not in the reservoir area (reference Fishes of Tennessee by D. Etnier and W.C. Starnes). The two mollusk species are considered extirpated from the area due to impoundment of the Powell River when crating Norris Reservoir. Due to these reasons there will be no impact to these species and I concur with approval.

- | | | | |
|-----|--|------------|----------------|
| | By: Tim D Pruitt | 09/01/2017 | |
| | Files: 282636-Larger_Results_table.pdf | 05/30/2017 | 120.84 Bytes |
| 2. | Shawnee response | | |
| | By: Marianne M Shuler | 08/25/2017 | |
| | Files: TVA, PROPOSED WATER USE FACILITIES AT NORRIS POINT CAMPGROUND, CAMPBELL COUNTY, TENNESSEE_Shawnee Response.pdf | 08/25/2017 | 83.27 Bytes |
| 2. | SHPO Letter | | |
| | By: Marianne M Shuler | 08/25/2017 | |
| | Files: TVA_Norris Point Campground_Campbell County TN_SHPO_CID69761_30JUN2017.pdf | 08/25/2017 | 2,594.31 Bytes |
| 2. | THPO Letter | | |
| | By: Marianne M Shuler | 08/25/2017 | |
| | Files: TVA_Norris Point Campground_Campbell County TN_THPO_CID69761_29JUN2017.pdf | 08/25/2017 | 2,629.95 Bytes |
| 2. | TVA finds the undertaking will have no effect to historic properties (see attached) "CEC36829_RLR282636_69761_section106.pdf" for supporting documentation. | | |
| | By: Marianne M Shuler | 08/25/2017 | |
| | Files: CEC36829_RLR282636_69761_Section106.pdf | 08/25/2017 | 1,855.13 Bytes |
| 2. | SHPO response | | |
| | By: Marianne M Shuler | 08/25/2017 | |
| | Files: TVA_Norris Point_Campbell Co TN_ 15AUG2017_SHPO Response.pdf | 08/25/2017 | 261.97 Bytes |
| 2. | Cherokee Nation response | | |
| | By: Marianne M Shuler | 08/25/2017 | |
| | Files: TVA Norris Point Campground 071117_Cherokee nation response.pdf | 08/25/2017 | 315.51 Bytes |
| 8. | The proposed actions are considered as repetitive actions in the 100-year floodplain. TVA determined there were no practical alternatives to avoid placing these structures within the 100-year floodplain and has established criteria which normally will ensure there will be an insignificant affect to natural and beneficial floodplain values. | | |
| | By: Tyler Ferguson | 08/25/2017 | |
| 9. | Based on a review of the ALIS Heritage data base data there will be no effects on ecologically critical areas, federal, state, or local park lands, national or state forests, wilderness areas, scenic areas, wildlife management areas, recreational areas, greenways, or trails. I concur with approval. | | |
| | By: Tim D Pruitt | 05/30/2017 | |
| 10. | This action will not contribute to the spread of exotic or invasive species. I concur with approval. | | |
| | By: Tim D Pruitt | 05/30/2017 | |
| 11. | This action will not potentially affect migratory bird populations. I concur with approval. | | |
| | By: Tim D Pruitt | 05/30/2017 | |
| 13. | There are no additional commitments recommended beyond standard TVA requirements—i.e., compliance with all applicable federal, state and local environmental laws and regulations, proper implementation of BMPs and best engineering practices, and proper containment/treatment/disposal of wastewaters, stormwater runoff, wastes, and potential pollutants. It is recommended that the Tennessee Valley Clean Marina Guidebook for BMPs and site management be implemented and followed to ensure no adverse impacts to surface waters | | |
| | By: W. D White | 08/11/2017 | |

16. Myotis grisescens (gray bat), Myotis sodalis (Indiana bat), and Myotis septentrionalis (Northern Long-eared bat) are listed as a federally endangered or threatened species that might potentially be found in this area. All three species hibernate in caves. Gray bats roost in caves year-round and forage over streams and rivers. Indiana and northern long-eared bats migrate from winter caves using transient caves along their migration routes, then both species roost during the summer behind loose bark of dead or dying trees or in tree cavities, this includes both individual bats and maternity colonies. Northern long-eared bats are also known to roost in buildings, bridges, and culverts. Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat forage within and around forests, as well as over bodies of water. Within a 3 mile search radius of the project site EORs occurred for 1 bat record and 2 caves. The 1 bat record is a possible historic record for Indiana Bats in one of those two caves. The last survey showed between 0-20 Indiana bats and that survey was in 2002 (See attached reports on the cave(s) and bat use in attachments to Section 2; Questions 1 and 16 if needed). No new vegetation management is being requested and the caves will not be impacted. There will be no impacts.
By: Tim D Pruitt 05/30/2017
Files: Combined-MYSO_21303-Cave_5853.pdf 05/30/2017 226.29 Bytes
CaveInfo-1139.pdf 05/30/2017 99.54 Bytes
17. This action will not potentially affect unique or important aquatic habitat, see response for Question 1 above. I concur with approval.
By: Tim D Pruitt 05/30/2017
6. Review of the ALIS Heritage Wetland data base, the site photos and the SIC reveals no wetlands in this area. Therefore no wetland impacts will occur if permitted. I concur with approval.
By: Tim D Pruitt 05/30/2017
7. Review of the site photos and project plans reveals no water flow, stream banks or stream channels will be affected. Therefore no impacts will occur if permitted. I concur with approval.
By: Tim D Pruitt 05/30/2017

Part 3 Comments

2. The water use facilities under review will not directly result in additional water pollutants being discharged into the reservoir. Leaks and accidents from recreational boats utilizing the facility may indirectly contribute to water pollutants entering into the reservoir. Due to the capacity of the proposed facility and the other private water use facilities in the area, the potential for increases in water pollutants being discharged by accident specifically from the facility under review is minor.
By: W. D White 08/11/2017
4. Insignificant with implementation of General and Standard Conditions including BMPs
By: Tyler Ferguson 05/15/2017
4. Indirect impacts of wave action from boats utilizing the facility may increase the potential for shoreline erosion. Due to the limited capacity of the proposed facilities and the other existing private docks along the shoreline, indirect impacts from the construction of the facility should be insignificant.
By: W. D White 08/11/2017
5. The proposed concrete launching ramp is considered to be a discharge of fill material. The proposed launching ramp will have no impacts with the implementation of the appropriate TVA General and Standard Conditions which include Best Management Practices. The proposed launching ramp falls within the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation's (TDEC) limits of a General Permit, and TDEC issued a Notice of Construction (NOC).
By: Tyler Ferguson 08/25/2017
6. The facility under review will not generate a large amount of solid wastes. Trash and solid wastes may be generated by the back lying campground. These wastes should be handled in accordance with appropriate laws and regulations.
By: W. D White 08/11/2017
12. Noise impacts can be expected during the construction of the facility. Construction noise impacts are anticipated to be temporary. Construction work would be restricted to daylight hours.

Motor boats accessing the facility may produce short, elevated bursts of noise emissions. These emissions are a result of the speed of the watercraft and other operational factors. However, these same noise impacts would be occurring in the area as a result of the numerous other docks along the shoreline. The proposed facility would not lead to a significant increase in noise impacts.
By: W. D White 08/11/2017

Part 4 Comments

2. Per 8/1/2017 Email from Recreation Specialists, Jerry Fouse:

Tennessee Wildlife Resource Agency (TWRA) provided copies of the Recreational Boating Accident and Incidence Reports between Powell River Mile 13-19 for the three year period from 2014-2016, inclusive. This area included the Davis Creek and Powell River areas of the proposed dock project by Norris Point Campground.

A review of this data showed one boating incident, a stationary vessel explosion and fire located at Davis Creek Mile 3.4 +/- as result of leaking fuel and poorly vented fumes resulting in injuries and damage but no fatality. No moving boat accidents were reported in this reach of Davis Creek and the Powell River for the three year period as reviewed.

Conclusion is that boating accidents/collisions seem to be nonexistent in this reach of Davis Creek and the Powell River. With boaters continuing to comply with TWRA "boat operator safety rules" recreational boating should continue to be a safe pursuit in this section of Norris Reservoir (Davis Creek and the Powell River). TVA has no recreational boating assessment evidence on which to deny the 26a permit application and should move forward with approval.

- By: W. D White 08/11/2017
4. The location of the proposed facility on tract XNR-174 is currently allocated as Zone 1, Non-TVA shoreline, in the Norris Reservoir Land Plans. The deed for this tract indicates that the owner has the rights to apply for water use facility.
- The proposed water use facilities would be for the private use of the back-lying, private campground. Public use of the facilities would be prohibited. If the property owner proposes a commercial marina at this location, an additional agreement with TVA would be required for the use and occupancy of the TVA land below the 1020-foot contour elevation.
- By: W. D White 09/01/2017
10. The facility under review will not directly impact highway or railroad systems. The construction of the facilities may increase the amount of boats trailered to the area, the volume of traffic would be minor and would not overload the existing roadway infrastructure.
- By: W. D White 08/11/2017
8. Per 8/14/17 email from Recreation Specialist, Jerry Fouse, there is always an issue of congestion at the "Common Congregation Points" along the reservoir system. These areas are typically representative of boat ramps, marinas, and community docks where boats ingress and egress the waterway in mass. Once boat disperse through the main channel at Davis Creek Mile 0, it becomes a matter of boat operator safety. The reservoir surface acres in the area of the proposed actions can easily handle the additional watercraft stored at the proposed facilities, assuming there would be one vessel per campsite.
- By: Tyler Ferguson 08/25/2017
9. The project site is located on Section 10 waters and requires the review of the USACE. Per 7/10/17 email from TVA's Navigation Program Supervisor, Nikki Berger, because the proposed facilities do not extend beyond one third of the width of the cove, and the proposed structures were not being placed in a navigation restricted area there would be no impacts to navigation as a result of the proposed actions.
- By: Tyler Ferguson 08/25/2017
- Files: Navigation_Comment.pdf 08/25/2017 116.49 Bytes

CEC Permit Listing

Part 3 Permits

5. Section 404 Permit (¿404 Clean Water Act)
- By: Tyler Ferguson 08/25/2017
5. Aquatic Resource Alteration Permit
- By: Tyler Ferguson 08/25/2017

Part 4 Permits

9. Section 10 Permit (¿10 Rivers and Harbor Act)
- By: Tyler Ferguson 08/25/2017

CEC Commitment Listing